

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/075,244	02/15/2002	Hiroyuki Nakano	501.41175X00	7857	
20457 7.	590 04/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	I, TERRY, STOUT & K	PADGETT, MARIANNE L			
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1762		

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/075,244	NAKANO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Marianne L. Padgett	1762	

Advisory Action	10/075,244	NAKANO ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
-	Marianne L. Padgett	1762				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 18 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverser, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILEI	D WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened standard, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the safter the mailing date of the final rejection	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) by reduce any			
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of App was filed on <u>18 April 2005</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS.	CFR 41.37 must be filed within twereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid d	o months of the date ismissal of the appea	of filing the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belowing appeal; and/or (d) They present additional eleips without consoling a	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying				
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 	16 and 41.33(a)).		(PTOL-324)			
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).): the 112 in section 2 of the action	mailed 11/18/04.				
7. Solve For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19-35.		rill be entered and an	explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ut bafana an am tha data af filimm a N	.l_4; f				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	is necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appeliant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been consideration.		•				
because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	/DTO (0D (00					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	// MARIANI	NE PADGETT				
Mary	enn X asyl PRIMAR	Y EXAMINER				
.S. Patent and Trademark Office						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

HL

Application No. 10/075244

Part of Paper No. 20050427

Continuation of 3. NOTE: (i) The use of a "database storing predetermined relationships..." is a new issue not previously considered; (ii) when reviewed in light of the cited support on p.30-32, the "relationships...state of contamination..." appear to include New Matter, because while cited pages support predetermined (= in-advance) state is the thickness or profile or position, they do not support the broadly claimed state that may include composition or microstructure, etc; (iii) are the 2 "a signal obtained..." & "a state..." in lines 14-18 of claim 1 the same or different limitations? Also note in line 16 "step" was not changed to "operation", so lacks antecedence. (iv) In claim 12, lines 15-16, "an inside of said plasma" does not make sense or is non-idiomatic, is a new issue & not clarified by applicants' further citations on p.21 or 35-37, however "predetermined relation of imaging" also on these lines, discussed on p.21, lines 15-end-of-page, while not related to "inside of said plasma", is discussed in relationship to the gathering of scattered light from an area over or "in front of" a wafer (from edge to edge), which is not the scope claimed & if overlapping is narrower, hence also includes New Matter. (v) The scope of the last 4 lines of claim 12 needs to be similarly evaluated for New Matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (i) the above noted New Matter issues & new clarity issues. (ii) The prior art needs evaluation & search in light of new issues with consideration of whether or not use of databases in the scope as claimed, would have been obvious. Note light was used & processed in the applied prior art references, hence the detector therefore were inherently "optical" & as the light detected was not random, it may be said to be predetermined.

Continuation of 13. Other: The proposed drawing corrections would be acceptable to the examiner.

On the PTOL-326 of the 11/18/04 mailing its noted that item 6) should read claims 1-18 are rejected (as above) & on p.3, section 5 (3rd line) of that action, a --6-- should be inserted in front of "section" when referring to paper #9.

MARIANNE PADGETT PRIMARY EXAMINER